



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,473	07/30/2002	Ronald de Groot	294-120 PCT/US	4102
7590	03/20/2006			
Ronald J Baron Hoffmann & Baron 6900 Jericho Turnpike Syosset, NY 11791				
			EXAMINER GRASER, JENNIFER E	
			ART UNIT 1645	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/049,473

Applicant(s)

DE GROOT ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer E. Graser

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39,41-44 and 46-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39,41-44 and 46-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Acknowledgment and entry of the Amendment submitted on 11/14/05 is made.

Claims 39, 41-44 and 46-48 are currently pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-New Matter***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 39, 41-44 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The new limitation "which has an Expect value as determined by Blast or Blastp computer programs of less than  $2e^{-27}$  when compared to SEQ ID NO: 2" is new matter. Written support was not found in the specification for this new limitation. The bottom of page 4 teaches that Blast and/or Blastp computer programs were used for the comparison of the sequence of the protein isolated from *S.pneumoniae* with known sequences in various databases. Expect values are described and it is recited that the cut-off for a functionally homologous Pmp would be defined as an E-value of  $10^{-10}$ . However, the limitation "which has an Expect value as determined by Blast or Blastp

computer programs of less than  $2e^{-27}$  when compared to SEQ ID NO: 2" is not found.

Applicants must point to specific support for such limitation by page and line number or remove it from the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 39, 41-44 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 39, 44, 47 and 48 are vague and indefinite because they recite the new limitation "or a protein which has an Expect value as determined by Blast or Blastp computer programs of less than  $2e^{-27}$  when compared to SEQ ID NO: 2". This phrase is vague and indefinite because there are many different BLAST programs and databases. Computer programs can change thereby changing the structure of the composition for which patent protection is sought. The claimed structure may also change depending on which BLAST program is used thereby rendering the claim vague and indefinite. The metes and bounds of the claimed invention cannot be understood.

***Prior Art***

5. The former rejections of Claims 39, 41-44 and 46-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunsch et al (WO 98/18930), Claims 39, 41-44 and 46-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Black et al (US 6,348,328 B1), Claims 39, 42, 43, 47 and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by Swiss Prot. Accession No. Q02473, P15294 AND P14308 (April 7, 1999) in light of Applicant's admissions on page 5, lines 8-14 of the specification are withdrawn due to the new limitations. However, if this new matter is removed from the claims the rejections may be reinstated.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1645. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Remsen. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1645 Fax number is 571-273-8300 which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E. Graser whose telephone number is (571) 272-0858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith, can be reached on (571) 272-0864.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0500.



Jennifer Graser  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1645

3/15/06